

REMARKS

Claims 1-21 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 3, 7, and 9 are amended. Claims 20 and 21 are added. Support for the amendment to claim 1 and for added claims 20 and 21 can be found, e.g., in paragraphs [0036]-[0039] of the specification as filed. Claims 1, 8, and 13 are independent. Reconsideration of the present application as amended is respectfully requested.

Drawings

The Examiner is courteously requested to provide a Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (Form PTO-948) with the next official communication to confirm approval of the formal drawings filed with the present application by the Official Draftsperson.

Claim for Priority

The Examiner has acknowledged Applicant's claim for priority and receipt of the certified copy of the priority document. No further action is required at this time.

Information Disclosure Statement

The Examiner has acknowledged receipt of the Information Disclosure Statement filed November 1, 2001, and has returned an

initialed copy of the Form PTO-1449. No further action is required at this time.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)/§103(a)

Claims 1-3, 5-9, 11-13, and 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,065,226 to Kluitmans et al. Claims 4, 10, and 14 as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Kluitmans et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,346,564 to Kubota et al., and claims 18 and 19 are rejected as being unpatentable over Kluitmans et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,548,291 to Meier et al. Applicants respectfully traverse and request reconsideration of these rejections.

As amended, independent claim 1 recites a protection circuit for a semiconductor laser device having a combination of elements, wherein a first capacitor has a low impedance in a frequency region and a second capacitor has a low impedance in a frequency region different from the frequency region for the low impedance of the first capacitor.

Independent claim 8 recites a protection circuit for a semiconductor laser device having a combination of elements, including a resistor or coil connected in series with the semiconductor laser device, and a low frequency capacitor and a

high frequency capacitor that are connected in parallel with the semiconductor laser device on opposite sides of the resistor or coil.

Similarly, independent claim 13 recites a protection circuit for a semiconductor laser device having a combination of elements, including a resistor or coil connected in series with the semiconductor laser device, and a first capacitor and a second capacitor that are connected in parallel with the semiconductor laser device on opposite sides of the resistor or coil, the first capacitor and/or the second capacitor being a capacitor in which a low frequency capacitor and a high frequency capacitor are connected in parallel.

In contrast to Applicant's claimed invention, it is respectfully submitted that the cited art, including Kluitmans et al., Kubota et al., and Meier does not teach or suggest expanding the frequency region for the low impedance using two different capacitors whose impedances are low in different frequency regions, as recited in amended independent claim 1. This aspect of the present invention is illustrated, for example, by curves C and D in FIG. 2B.

Moreover, none of the cited references teaches or suggests the combined use of a low frequency capacitor and a high frequency

capacitor, as recited in independent claims 8 and 13 and as specifically defined in added claims 20 and 21.

M.P.E.P. §2131 and 706.02 require that for a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102 to be proper, a cited reference must teach or suggest each and every claimed element. To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), M.P.E.P. §2142 and 706.02(j) require that all claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the cited art.

Since Kluitmans et al., Kubota et al., and Meier et al. do not teach or suggest the above-noted features of independent claims 1, 8, and 13, it is respectfully submitted that the anticipation and obviousness rejections of the claims are improper and should be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that cited art fails to anticipate or render obvious the presently claimed invention, and withdrawal of the rejections based thereon is respectfully requested. Independent claims 1, 8, and 13 are allowable. Since the remaining claims depend directly or indirectly from allowable independent claims 1, 8, and 13, they are also allowable for at least the reasons set forth above, as well as for the

additional limitations provided by these claims. Accordingly, all claims should be allowable.

CONCLUSION

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and that the present application is in condition for allowance.

Should any issues remain, however, the Examiner is invited to telephone Daniel K. Dorsey (Reg. No. 32,520) at (703) 205-8000 in an effort to expedite prosecution.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§1.17 and 1.136(a), Applicant requests a one-month extension in which to file this reply. Attached is a check for \$128, including \$110 for the extension and \$18 for extra claims.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees

required under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17, particularly extension of
time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By


Terrell C. Birch

Reg. No. 19,382

P. O. Box 747

Falls Church, VA 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

20-4887P

TCB:DKD:rk

